

Appl. No. 10/648,523  
Amdt. dated May 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 13D. This sheet, which includes Fig. 13D, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 13D. In Fig. 13D, the reference numeral for the scraper, which was previously labeled (763) has been changed to (759).

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Appl. No. 10/648,523  
Amdt. dated May 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

### REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated February 10, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claim 2 has been canceled, without prejudice, claims 1 and 3 have been amended, and new claims 58-62 have been added. The Examiner's indication that claims 7-18 contain allowable subject matter is gratefully acknowledged. The specification and drawings have been amended to correct typographical errors, and the amendment is fully supported by the disclosure. No new matter has been added by the amendment.

#### *Drawing Objections*

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) since certain reference characters were used to refer to apparently different elements. The specification has been amended to correct reference characters (712), (720), (761a), (763) and (775f). The specification was amended to consistently refer to "light incident surface" as reference character (712). The specification was amended to consistently refer to "light reflection pattern" as reference character (720). The specification was amended to consistently refer to "mask body" as (761a). Regarding reference character (763), the specification was amended to consistently refer to "pattern printer" as (763) and to refer to "scraper" as (759). Figure 13D was amended to reflect the change in reference character for the scraper. The specification was also amended to consistently refer to "prism pattern recesses" as (775f).

The Examiner stated that reference character (362) refers to "pattern" and "second light reflection pattern" at page 16 lines 7 and 15, respectively. It is respectfully submitted that no character (362) is found throughout the specification. However, element (632) is consistently referred to as "a second light reflection pattern." For the sake of clarity, Applicants have amended the specification to refer to element (632) as "a third light reflection pattern."

Accordingly, Applicant's respectfully request that the drawing objections be withdrawn.

#### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112*

Appl. No. 10/648,523  
Amdt. dated May 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claim 2 has been canceled, without prejudice, thus the rejection of claim 2 is now moot.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)***

Claims 1-6, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ashall, U.S. Patent No 5,390,436 (hereinafter "Ashall").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). It is respectfully submitted that Ashall fails to teach each and every element as set forth in the claim 1 for at least the reasons described below. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice, thus the rejection of claim 2 is now moot.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, each of the dots having a geometrically regular pattern formed on a corresponding dot. In other words, the claimed invention includes a light reflecting pattern having multiple dots, and each of the dots also has a geometrically regular pattern formed thereon.

In contrast, Ashall merely discloses a transparent medium (10) having dots (13). *See* col. 3, lines 14-17 and Figure 1. There is no disclosure in Ashall of anything about a pattern formed on each dot. Ashall neither teaches nor suggests a dot having a geometrically regular pattern formed thereon, as claimed in claim 1.

In the rejection, the Examiner has stated that the dots in Ashall inherently have "some roughness." It is respectfully submitted that "some roughness" inherent in the surface of a dot, does not constitute a geometrically regular pattern as recited in claim 1. An inherently rough nature cannot be said to constitute a pattern, nor is an inherent roughness geometrically regular. Thus, Ashall fails to teach dots each having a geometrically regular pattern formed thereon, as claimed in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct and nonobvious in view of Ashall. Claims 3-6, 19 and 20 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, thus include all the limitations of claim 1. Thus, claims 3-6, 19 and 20 are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claim 1, which is believed to be allowable.

Appl. No. 10/648,523  
Amdt. dated May 10, 2005  
Reply to Office action of Feb. 10, 2005

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections of claims 1, 3-6, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

***Newly Added Claims***

Applicants have added new claims 58-62 to more particularly define aspects of the present invention. The new claims include no new matter and are fully supported by the specification and the drawings of the present application.

Accordingly, it is believed that the new claims are in condition for allowance.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Jae Y. Park  
Reg. No. (SEE ATTACHED)  
Confirmation No. 4676  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: May 10, 2005

Page 20 of 20

21C-0065/LW8091US/SK